

JOHNSON's views and wish to restate them for the record. I voted for H.R. 1022 yesterday as a means of allowing the debate to continue. Like Mr. JOHNSON, I find the bill flawed and in need of much improvement by the Senate or conference committee. If the bill is not improved, I will not be able to vote for its final passage. Overall, I support the general thrust of requiring risk assessment and cost-benefit tests for Federal regulations. However, like the gentleman from South Dakota, I believe that the current version of this legislation will lead to costly increases in Federal bureaucracy and litigation, and possibly pose a risk to public health and safety. The House leadership seems more concerned about making political statements with this bill than in crafting legal language that would actually serve the public interest. I am optimistic, however, that this issue will receive more deliberate and responsible consideration in the Senate, and I believe it should now be moved to the Senate for that consideration. Again, I want to make it clear that like Mr. JOHNSON, I will not vote for final passage of this legislation unless significant improvements have been made.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT D. CLARK

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1995

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a selfless community leader and constituent, Mr. Robert Clark. For 25 years, Mr. Clark served as general manager of the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District [GCID]. He was also secretary to the district's board of directors.

His job was a difficult one, and he carried it out with incredible success and professionalism. Water is an extremely important resource, especially to the farmers and ranchers in agricultural-rich California. Back home, my constituents depend on this all-important resource for their livelihood and for the lives of a country that depends on the nourishment from their agricultural product.

Mr. Clark was responsible for ensuring water delivery to approximately 175,000 acres of land. He was in charge of mitigating all of the problems associated with water delivery, and let me tell you from firsthand experience the headaches are, indeed, many. I have worked with Mr. Clark and the GCID board of directors on difficult and ongoing issues such as salmon protection, riffle restoration, and dredging.

In this time of intense struggle for balance among environmental protection and water and land use, Mr. Clark was a rational and calm voice. His constant demeanor was remarkable considering that he supervised water deliveries to over 20,000 acres in three national wildlife refuges. On his watch, GCID irrigated up to 140,000 acres in fertile agricultural land.

Among his most notable accomplishments, was a \$20 million rehabilitation program for the district's main canal system, including the construction early last decade of a new pump station. That effort added capacity and increased the security of the water distribution system.

Mr. Clark also accomplished the refinement of hydraulic measurement within the district, which led to the implementation of more equitable water distribution to water users.

In addition to his work at GCID, Mr. Clark has participated in professional water resource activities, worked as an international consultant in the irrigation field and served as a director of the Water Education Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Mr. Clark for his many years of service to the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District. Personally, I will miss him very much. I wish him much happiness and continued success in all his future endeavors.

KCPT PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1995

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with the House of Representatives on the verge of considering rescissions legislation that would cut Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by 15 percent in 1996 and 30 percent in 1997, I commend to my colleagues a statement recently prepared by William R. Reed, the president of KCPT—channel 19, which is Kansas City's public television station.

Bill's statement, which is a response to common reasons given for the elimination of Federal funding for public broadcasting, follows:

REASONS GIVEN FOR THE ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING (By Bill Reed)

1. Public broadcasting funds liberal and controversial programs with federal dollars. Taxpayers' money should not be used for these purposes.

While KCPT does not receive large numbers of complaints about our political coverage, those received come equally from both left and right. For example, KCPT received many calls from liberals who were upset that McNeil/Lehrer devoted a large amount of time interviewing Senator Dole and Congressman Gingrich. And on the other side, we hear complaints about Bill Moyers' alleged liberal bias. But on balance, I believe KCPT is perceived by most viewers to be apolitical or non-political, as we should be. I think that McNeil/Lehrer is the most balanced program covering political issues on television anywhere.

PBS is aware of this criticism, and I have heard that staff are taking steps to ensure more internal balance in individual programs, rather than relying on balance over a series of programs. PBS President Ervin Duggan's proposed Democracy Project, which is coverage of the 1996 national elections, will have an emphasis on fairness and balance.

The statement that public television occasionally airs controversial programming is true, and the program of controversy last year was Armistead Maupin's *Tales of the City*, a six-hour series about San Francisco in the mid 1970s.

Before KCPT aired *Tales*, Dave Welsh, Vice President for Broadcasting, Katherine Soden, Director of Programming, and I viewed the series at least twice. The decision to air the series was not an easy one because we knew that it would be controversial—it

contained strong language, drug use, homosexual relationship and some brief nudity (and no sex or violence). But it was also brilliant television with a legitimate look at a specific time and place in our history. The series was a moral tale with the central character, Mary Ann, a young woman from the Midwest who did not give in to the lifestyles of that time—the drug use and the promiscuity—because of her values. *Tales of the City* was more a story about the emptiness of lives lived without commitment, without a moral core, than anything else.

KCPT received about 200 telephone calls and letters about the series—about 100 for and 100 against. Congress, however, reportedly received over 100,000 postcards as a result of a national campaign by the American Family Association and its president, the Reverend Donald E. Wildmon, against the series.

Even if one did not like the series, should funding be eliminated because of six hours of programming? What about the other 5,994 hours KCPT airs each year? Obviously, *Tales* and other potentially controversial programs raise some profound questions. Should KCPT censor programs if we think they might be controversial, even if they are good television dealing with legitimate issues? What about individual choice? And what about the "off" button? But these questions, as they relate to this series, anyway, may be moot. PBS has decided not to fund a sequel to *Tales of the City*.

2. We should privatize public television.

One of public television's strengths is that it serves many specialized audiences: Sewing programs, the old Lawrence Welk shows, cooking programs, GED programming, gardening programs, carpentry programs, how-to-fix-up-your-house programs, and painting programs. All these target audience programs would disappear because there simply are not large enough audiences to support them with commercial advertising.

Programming currently airing on Discovery, Arts and Entertainment and Nickelodeon cable channels attract smaller audiences than on public television, but they continue to exist financially because those channels are owned by large corporations with a financial interest in the success of cable television as a larger business. For example, Nickelodeon is owned by Viacom, Inc., which also owns the MTV and VH-1 cable channels. While there are commercials on those channels, they are also supported by the cable companies' carriage fees and their owners' subsidies. None of those three cable channels is making a profit—they are loss leaders for the cable companies. But, to the public and to members of Congress, the impression is that those channels are making it in the marketplace because they see commercials on them, and everyone knows that commercial television is a successful business. That is not true for all cable channels, but that news is seldom reported because the cable channels not making profits continue to operate.

To privatize public television means that we would have to at least break even to continue to exist, which would be impossible if we continue to broadcast the special audience programs that we are currently carrying. Privatization would mean, as we know, common-denominator programming to serve large enough audiences to attract enough commercials to bring in the revenues to break even or to make a profit. Privatization would be the end of what we call public television today. And, privatization would mean another commercial television station (and probably another commercial radio station) in Kansas City. Do we need another one? Would it even be financially feasible?